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#### Abstract

Fault studies are an important part of electrical power system analysis. The purpose of this study was to determine the amount of line current at the point of disturbance when a three-phase balanced fault occurs in the real Sulbagsel electrical system. In this paper, a new hybrid FFA-ABC (Fruit Fly Algorithm-Artificial Bee Colony) method is proposed, which is one of the new methods used to calculate balanced three-phase short circuit currents in electric power systems, especially in the real Sulbagsel electrical system of South Sulawesi, Indonesia. The real electricity system of Sulbagsel was chosen as the research object because this system consists of 15 generators, 44 buses, 52 transmission lines, and 29 load buses with system voltages varying from $30 \mathrm{kV}, 70 \mathrm{kV}, 150 \mathrm{kV}$, and 275 kV so that this system is included in the complex system category. To test the effectiveness of the proposed FFA-ABC method, it was implemented on a real electric power system, namely the Sulbagsel System. In addition, it can also be applied to IEEE electrical systems or other real electric power systems. The results of the new hybrid FFA-ABC method of the balanced short circuit analysis of the Sulbagsel electrical system are then compared using the FFA method, the ABC method, and the deterministic method (in this case, the bus impedance matrix (BIM) method). The simulation results obtained show that the FFA-ABC hybrid method is able to solve the problem of balanced short circuit analysis in the Sulbagsel electrical system in South Sulawesi, Indonesia which the largest fault current occurs when the fault is close to the slack bus generator (bus $2=$ Sidrap) of 18.9697 p.u, and the smallest fault current occurs when the fault is farthest from the slack bus generator (bus $44=$ Poso) of 0.8457 p.u.
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## 1. Introduction

Electricity is a major need for regions or countries whose economies are growing, the increasing need for electrical energy supplies for society and industry will continue to be sought to supply electrical power from power plants, both thermal generators and renewable energy generators, so that it remains available in both quantity and quality. Voltage stability and reliability of the electric power system are very important in the distribution of electrical energy from power plants to interconnected load centers to ensure uninterrupted electricity supply.

An electric power system under normal conditions is assumed to be a balanced three-phase system. The balanced state will be disturbed if there is a disturbance or short circuit in the components of the power system. In the event of a disturbance, the current flowing through the transmission network to the fault point is very large. The fault current is much greater than the maximum allowable current to flow in transmission lines, generators, or other equipment. If the safety devices do not work immediately, the very large current increase causes an increase in temperature, which can cause damage to the equipment or device. Short circuit disturbance is a type of disturbance that can cause the distribution of electrical energy to be hampered. Short circuit disturbances are usually caused by damage to the insulating material in the conductor and faults can damage electrical equipment if it is not equipped with a good protection system and correct. Therefore, special planning is needed to reduce the risk of these disturbances. One way to overcome this is to conduct a short circuit fault current analysis study. In the electric power system, there are three types of studies carried out to ensure the continuity of the generation and distribution of the electric power system: power flow studies, short circuit studies, and stability studies. Power flow studies are the determination or calculation of voltage, current, active power and reactive power found at various points of the electrical network in normal operating
conditions, both currently running and those that are expected to occur in the future. The short circuit study is an analysis of the electricity network to determine the magnitude of the electrical fault, current, and voltage that occur on the bus that is experiencing interference and other buses in the interconnected electrical network system. While, Electric power system stability is the ability of the electric power system or its component parts to maintain synchronization and balance in the system. The system stability limit is the maximum power that flows through a point in the system without causing a loss of stability. In this research, researchers focused on short circuit studies to determine the magnitude of the fault current and voltage that occurs on the bus. The magnitude of the fault current in the system depends on the internal impedance of the generator plus the impedance of the system circuit. As in (Saadat, 1999), the balanced or symmetrical three-phase fault is defined as a disturbance that occurs in all phases and can be solved on a per-phase basis.

A short circuit is one of the disturbances in the electric power system that has transient characteristics that must be overcome by safety equipment. The occurrence of a short circuit causes a current surge with a magnitude higher than normal, and the voltage in that place becomes very low. Likewise, in (Sallam \& Malik, 2019), the three-phase symmetrical short-circuit fault type is the most severe of the faults because it produces the highest short-circuit current of the same magnitude in each of the three phases. In (Murty, 2017), short circuit analysis is primarily required to compute the three-phase fault levels at one or more busses (nodes) in the electrical power system and evaluate the fault currents for faults on transmission lines and the corresponding contribution from the adjacent busses. Fault levels can be different for unloaded and loaded systems. When the fault level has to be computed considering loads, prefault bus voltages at the faulted nodes are required. These should be computed using a load flow program. Like in (Sabbir \& Rashed, 2015), balanced three-phase faults can be analyzed using an equivalent single-phase circuit.

The aim of this research is to determine the magnitude of the largest and smallest fault currents that occur in the real electricity system of Sulbagsel. In this case, a study analysis of a balanced three-phase short circuit of the real Sulbagsel electrical power system was carried out using the new FFA-ABC hybrid method approach. The new FFA-ABC hybrid method combines two artificial intelligence methods, namely, the Fruit Fly Algorithm method (FFA method) and the Artificial Bee Colony method (ABC method). The selection of the hybrid FFA-ABC method in solving short circuit analysis problems in power systems is based on the characteristics of the FFA method and the ABC method in solving problems to get the best solution, namely (1) both of these methods are included in the computational method and quantitative method, (2) both of these methods are included in the heuristic method and the artificial intelligence category, (3) both of these methods are included in the swarm method, (4) both of these methods have quite fast computing times. The results of the new FFA-ABC hybrid method compare with the FFA method, the ABC method and deterministic method namely bus impedance matrix (BIM) method.

The fruit fly method (FFA) was introduced by Wen-Tsao Pan in 2012 (Wen-Tsao Pan, 2012). This method is a part of the artificial intelligence method and also heuristic method which works based on the sense of smell and sight of fruit flies which can collect aromas and food sources from the air even though the food source is 40 km away. While, the ABC method was introduced by D. Karaboga in 2007 (Karaboga \& Basturk, 2008). This method works to solve complex problems (Nurlita Gamayanti, Abdullah Alkaff, 2015). In the ABC method, the bee colony consists of three groups of bees, namely employed bees, onlooker bees and scout bees. The first half of the colony consists of employed bees and the second half is the onlooker bees. For each food source, there is only one employed bee. In other words, the number of employed bees is equal to the number of food sources around the hive. The FFA and ABC methods have been widely used to solve complex problems in the financial sector, in the health sector, in the informatics sector, and in the electrical power sector.

The application of the FFA method in various sectors has been studied by several previous researchers, such as new fruit fly optimization algorithm: taking the financial distress model as an example (Wen-Tsao Pan, 2012) in the financial sector, a new fruit fly optimization algorithm enhanced support vector machine for diagnosis of breast cancer based on high-level features in the health sector (Huang et al., 2019) in the health sector, development of an optoelectronic sensor
for detecting and classifying fruit fly (diptera: tephritidae) for use in real-time intelligent traps (Moraes, Nava, Scheunemann, \& da Rosa, 2019) in the informatics sector, and several application of fruit fly method in the electrical power sector such as economic dispatch of power system based on improved fruit fly optimization algorithm (Liang, Zhang, Wang, \& Jia, 2019), fruit fly optimization ( FFO ) for solving economic dispatch problem in power system (Geruna, Rul, et al., 2017), optimal sitting and parameter selection for fault current limiters considering optimal economic dispatch of generators (Guang, Xiaolong, \& Mengzhou, 2018). Meanwhile, the application of the ABC method in various sectors has also been studied by several previous researchers, such as skin lesion segmentation method for dermoscopy images using artificial bee colony algorithm (Aljanabi, Özok, Rahebi, \& Abdullah, 2018) in health sector, an efficient framework for remote sensing parallel processing: integrating the artificial bee colony algorithm and multiagent technology (Yang, Sun, \& Li, 2019) in the informatic sector, Effects of memory and genetic operators on Artificial Bee Colony algorithm for Single Container Loading problem (Bayraktar, Ersöz, \& Kubat, 2021) in transportation sector, and also several application of ABC method in the electrical power sector such as an improved local search involving bee colony optimization using lambda iteration combined with a golden section search method to solve an economic dispatch problem (Aurasopon \& Khamsen, 2019), and optimal power sharing in microgrids using the artificial bee colony algorithm (Ullah, Jiang, Geng, Rahim, \& Khan, 2022).

## 2. Literature Review

A literature review is an activity to review or review various literature previously published by academics or other researchers regarding the topic to be researched.

## 1. Balanced Short Circuit

One of the short circuit faults in the electric power system is a balanced short circuit fault or symmetrical short circuit fault. Therefore, several studies that have been conducted by previous researchers related to balanced short circuit analysis are described as follows: As (Sabbir \& Rashed, 2015) describe, electrical power system fault analysis is the process of determining the bus voltage and line currents during the occurrence of various types of faults. The determination of the bus voltage and line currents is essential in the fault analysis of the electrical power system. The calculation process consists of various methods of mathematical calculation which are difficult to perform by hand, but can be easily done by using a computer device. Meanwhile, (Karthik, Shiva, Ali Siddique, \& Shahabaz Ahmed, 2017) say that fault analysis is an important consideration in power system planning, protection equipment selection, and overall power system reliability assessment. Faults usually occur in a power system due to insulation failure, flashover, physical damage, or human error, and these faults may be three-phase in nature, involving all three phases in a balanced or symmetrical manner.

As in (Latt, 2019), an electrical fault in an electrical power system is the deviation of current and voltage from nominal values or states, and under steady-state operating conditions, electrical power system lines or types of equipment carry normal voltage and current, which results in a safer operation of the system network. If a fault occurs, it causes excessively high currents to flow, which cause damage to equipment and devices. Normally, fault analysis is calculated in per-unit quantities as it provides solutions that are somewhat consistent over different voltage and power ratings and operate on values of the order of unity. However, (O, A, \& U, 2018) state that faults often occur in three-phase electrical power systems, and with the increasing demand for electrical power, one key challenge is the ability to identify and analyze these faults when they occur. A fault current is any abnormal electric current flowing through a nonrequired current, and in three-phase systems, a fault may involve one or more phases and ground or may occur only between phases. The prospective short circuit current of a predictable fault can be calculated for most situations. Likewise, in (Ghadban \& AbdulWahhab, 2015), the short circuit problem is one of the most important and complex tasks in an electrical power system. Studies of these faults are necessary to ensure that the electrical power system is reliable, and the severity of the fault depends on the short circuit location, the path taken by the fault current, the system impedance, and its voltage level. Fault analysis is the process of evaluating the system voltages and currents under various types of short circuits.

The researcher (Brockhoeft, 2014) states that a balanced three-phase short circuit fault is defined as a simultaneous short circuit across all three phases of a transmission line, and a balanced three-phase fault is also called a symmetric fault because the power system remains in balance after the fault occurs, but if not cleared promptly, it can easily develop into a three-phase fault. Furthermore, in (Kakilli, 2013), a balanced three-phase fault current at a given bus of the system is calculated by using different methods, especially with the emphasis on the MVA method, compared to other conventional methods, and fault calculations provide information on the currents and voltage levels of an electrical power system during fault conditions. Sufficient accuracy in fault studies can be obtained with certain simplifications in the model of the power system. In (ETEBMS, 2017), short circuit analysis is performed to protect the system from any damage and limit the flow of current in the system. Short circuit analysis is done to determine the proper choice of protective devices, select efficient interrupting equipment, and verify the adequacy of the existing interrupting equipment. The analysis before the fault is carried out by solving the nonlinear load flow problem using the numerical iterative technique of the NewtonRaphson method. As in (Santamaria, 2011), the analysis of electrical power systems under fault conditions represents one of the most important and complex tasks in electrical power systems. The study of faults is necessary to ensure that the reliability and stability of the power system do not suffer a decrement as a result of a critical event such as a fault. Meanwhile, in (Gajbhiye, Kulkarni, \& Soman, 2005), a fundamental principle that has been used in fault modeling is that the fault model should depict the change perceived by the network. Even in the three-phase domain, Thevenin's equivalent circuit representation is available for standard shunt faults, and a fault that involves multiple instances of either the same or different fault types will be referred to as a simultaneous fault.

A fault in a power system represents a structural network change equivalent to that caused by the addition of an impedance at the point of fault. If the fault impedance is zero, the fault is referred to as a bolted fault or a solid fault. In a balanced power system, there is no negative or zero sequence. The condition when a three-phase short circuit occurs can be seen in Figure 1.


Fig. 1. Three-Phase Short-Circuit Fault
The faulted network is usually, but not always, assumed to be without load before the fault occurs. In the absence of loads, no prefault currents flow and there are no voltage differences across the branch impedances, and all bus voltages throughout the network are then the same as $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{f}}$, the prefault voltage at the fault point. Thus, the voltages at all buses of the network can be calculated using the prefault voltage Vf of the faulted bus and the elements in the column $\mathrm{Z}_{\text {bus }}$ corresponding to the faulted bus. According to (J.Grainger \& William D.Stevenson, 2003), the calculated values of the bus voltage will yield the subtransient currents in the branches of the network if the system $Z_{b u s}$ has been formed with subtransient values for the machine reactances. If the three-phase fault occurs on bus k of a large-scale network, we can write it as:

$$
I_{f}^{\prime \prime}=\frac{V_{f}}{Z_{k k}}
$$

Meanwhile, the voltage at any bus $j$ during the fault is:

$$
V_{j}=V_{f}-Z_{j k} \cdot I_{f}^{\prime \prime}=V_{f}-\frac{Z_{j k}}{Z_{k k}} V_{f}
$$

where $Z_{j k}$ and $Z_{k k}$ are elements in column $k$ of the system $Z_{b u s}$. Furthermore, we can calculate the subtransient current $I_{f}^{\prime \prime}$ from bus j to bus k in the line of impedance Zb connecting those two buses as:

$$
I_{i j}^{\prime \prime}=\frac{V_{i}-V_{j}}{Z_{b}}=-I_{f}^{\prime \prime}\left(\frac{Z_{i k}-Z_{j k}}{Z_{b}}\right)=-\frac{V_{f}}{Z_{b}}\left(\frac{Z_{i k}-Z_{j k}}{Z_{k k}}\right)
$$

2. Fruit Fly Algorithm (FFA) Method

The FFA was introduced by Wen-Tsao Pan in 2012 (Wen-Tsao Pan, 2012) to solve complex problems that occur specifically in the financial sector. This FFA method works based on the sense of smell and sight which can detect the location of food sources that are quite far away. An illustration of fruit flies searching for and finding their food source is shown in Figure 2.


Fig. 2. Foraging scheme in fruit fly swarms (Geruna, Abdullah, et al., 2017)
The FFA method has advantages in terms of simple computational processes and ease in transforming concepts into program code. This FFA method is represented in the following steps:
a. Determine the starting position of the fruit fly swarm
$X_{\text {axis }}$ and $Y_{\text {axis }}$
b. Find the direction and distance of food sources randomly using the fruit fly's sense of smell $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}}=\mathrm{X}_{\text {axis }}+$ random value $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}}=\mathrm{Y}_{\text {axis }}+$ random value
c. Predict the distance of origin of fruit flies (Dist) because the location of the food is unknown by calculating the smell concentration value (S)
Dist $_{i}=\sqrt{X_{i}^{2}+Y_{i}^{2}}$
$S_{i}=\frac{1}{\text { Dist. }_{\mathrm{i}}}$
d. Substitute the smell concentration value ( S ) into the smell concentration variable (Smell) Smell ${ }_{i}=$ function $\left(S_{i}\right)$
e. Determine the maximum smell concentration among a swarm of fruit flies
[bestSmell, bestIndex]=max(Smell)
f. Maintain the best values of $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}$ coordinates and smell concentration

```
\(X_{\text {axis }}=X(\) bestIndex \()\)
\(Y_{\text {axis }}=Y(\) bestIndex)
Smellbest=bestSmell
```

g. Go to loop optimization, and repeat steps 2 to 5 and see when the current Smell concentration is better than the previous Smell concentration, if that is true, then execute step f.

## 3. Artificial Bee Colony (ABC) Method

The ABC method was developed by D. Karaboga in 2007 (Karaboga \& Basturk, 2008). In the ABC method, the bee colony consists of three groups of bees, namely employed bees, onlooker bees and scout bees. Onlooker bees choose a food source depending on the probability value associated with the food source $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{i}}$ calculated using Equation 14.

$$
P_{i}=\frac{\text { fit }_{i}}{\sum_{n=1}^{S N} f i t_{n}}
$$

where $\mathrm{fit}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is the fitness value of solution i which is proportional to the amount of nectar from the food source at position $i$ and SN is the number of food sources which is equal to the number of employed bees. The candidate food positions of the old ones in memory will be generated according to the equation 15 .

$$
v_{i j}=x_{i j}+\phi_{i j}\left(x_{i j}-x_{k j}\right)
$$

where $\mathrm{k} \in\{1,2, \ldots, \mathrm{SN}\}$ and $\mathrm{j} \in\{1,2, \ldots, \mathrm{D}\}$ are randomly selected indices. $\phi_{\mathrm{ij}}$ is a random number between $[-1,1]$.
This ABC method is represented in the following steps:
a. Enter the bee swarm parameters
b. Initialize the position of the bee colony
c. Calculate the fitness function
d. Find the minimum fitness
e. Enter the employed bee phase by finding new solutions
f. Evaluation of new solutions from the employed bee phase
g. Calculate the probability according to equation 14

$$
P_{i}=\frac{f i t_{i}}{\sum_{n=1}^{S N} f i t_{n}}
$$

h. Enter the onlooker bee phase to find new solutions
i. Evaluation of new solutions from the onlooker bee phase
j. Find the new fitness minimum of the onlooker bee phase
k. Enter the scout bee phase

1. Calculate fitness solution

## 3. Research Methods

Research or research comes from English (research), which means the process of gathering information with the aim of improving, modifying, or developing an investigation or research group. The type of research conducted by researchers is non-experimental quantitative research that is ex post facto, in which all data is processed based on existing data. Non-experimental research is research in which observations are made of research subjects according to their circumstances, without any manipulation (intervention) from researchers, and also aims to describe the situation and conditions of the research object.
The data collection technique used in this study was a literature study and secondary data collection.

## 1. Literature study

According to experts, the definition and understanding of literature study explain that literature study is the study of various reference books and similar previous research results in various publications that are useful for obtaining a theoretical basis on the problem to be studied
and is a data collection technique by conducting a review of various books, literature, and various reports relating to the problem to be solved.

## 2. Secondary data collection

The secondary data collection method is often called the method of using document materials, because in this case the researcher does not directly collect the data himself but examines and utilizes data or documents produced by other parties.
Data is a description of objects, events, activities, and transactions that have no meaning or have no direct effect on the user. The data used by the researchers in this case is secondary. Secondary data is data obtained by researchers from existing sources in the form of:
a. Single line diagram
b. Line data
c. Generator data
d. Load Data
e. Dynamic parameter data of generator

The test data was taken from the data interconnection electricity system of Sulawesi of South Part (Sulbagsel), South Sulawesi in Indonesia (Ansar Suyuti, Indar Chaerah Gunadin, 2017). Single line diagram of this interconnection electricity system shown in Figure 3.


Fig. 3. Single line diagram of the interconnection electricity system of the Sulbagsel.
Where:
bus $1=$ Sengkang 150
bus 2= Sidrap 150
bus $3=$ Soppeng 150
bus $4=$ Pare-Pare 150
bus $5=$ Pinrang 150
bus $6=$ Polmas 150
bus $7=$ Bakaru 150
bus $8=$ Majene 150
bus $9=$ Mamuju 150
bus $10=$ Suppa 150
bus $11=$ PLTU Barru 150
bus $12=$ Barru 150
bus $13=$ Pangkep 150
bus $14=$ Pangkep 70
bus $15=$ Tonasa 70
bus $16=$ Bosowa 150
bus $17=$ Kima 150
bus $23=$ Daya 70
bus $24=$ Tallo 30
bus $25=$ Barawaja 150
bus $26=$ Tallo Lama 150
bus $27=$ Tallo Lama 70
bus $28=$ Bontoala 150
bus 29= Sungguminasa 150
bus $30=$ Tanjung Bunga 150
bus $31=$ Tallasa 150
bus $32=$ Maros 150
bus $33=$ Punagaya 150
bus 34= Jeneponto 150
bus $35=$ Bulukumba 150
bus $36=$ Sinjai 150
bus $37=$ Bone 150
bus $38=$ Makale 150
bus $39=$ Palopo 150
bus $18=$ Tallo 150
bus $19=$ Panakukang 150
bus $20=$ Tallo 70
bus $21=$ Borongloe 150
bus $40=$ Ltupa 150
bus $41=$ PLTA Poso
bus $42=$ Pamona 275
bus $43=$ Pamona 150
bus $22=$ Mandai 70
bus $44=$ Poso
The real Sulbagsel interconnection electricity system operates at transmission line voltages of $30 \mathrm{kV}, 70 \mathrm{kV}, 150 \mathrm{kV}$, and 275 kV . The data for the real Sulbagsel Electrical System Transmission Line can be seen in Table 1. The data on the generator and load of the Sulbagsel Electrical System can be seen in Table 2. While the data for the generator dynamic parameters of the Sulbagsel electrical system can be seen in Table 3.

| From line | to line | R (PU) | X (PU) | 1/2 B (PU) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 0.01058 | 0.07259 | 0.00342 |
| 1 | 3 | 0.02106 | 0.1267 | 0.00404 |
| 2 | 3 | 0.05643 | 0.20275 | 0.00482 |
| 2 | 4 | 0.02003 | 0.07198 | 0.00142 |
| 4 | 5 | 0.01388 | 0.04974 | 0.00067 |
| 4 | 10 | 0.00787 | 0.02826 | 0.00056 |
| 4 | 11 | 0.01 | 0.07946 | 0.00396 |
| 4 | 6 | 0.03663 | 0.13159 | 0.01819 |
| 5 | 7 | 0.03076 | 0.11023 | 0.01012 |
| 6 | 7 | 0.02627 | 0.0944 | 0.00743 |
| 6 | 8 | 0.05261 | 0.18902 | 0.00372 |
| 8 | 9 | 0.03076 | 0.11023 | 0.01012 |
| 11 | 12 | 0.01173 | 0.03973 | 0.00198 |
| 12 | 13 | 0.02419 | 0.08667 | 0.01167 |
| 13 | 14 | 0 | 0.39492 | 0 |
| 13 | 16 | 0.0109 | 0.03919 | 0.00493 |
| 13 | 17 | 0.00845 | 0.03024 | 0.0038 |
| 14 | 15 | 0.03275 | 0.06013 | 0.00005 |
| 14 | 22 | 0.36318 | 0.66671 | 0.0005 |
| 16 | 18 | 0.04764 | 0.17071 | 0.00575 |
| 17 | 18 | 0.00845 | 0.03024 | 0.0038 |
| 18 | 26 | 0.00726 | 0.026 | 0.00088 |
| 18 | 19 | 0.04334 | 0.07958 | 0.00006 |
| 18 | 29 | 0.00385 | 0.02635 | 0.00124 |
| 18 | 20 | 0 | 0.41587 | 0 |
| 18 | 24 | 0 | 0.5535 | 0 |
| 26 | 27 | 0 | 0.41587 | 0 |
| 27 | 28 | 0.04046 | 0.07428 | 0.00006 |
| 20 | 21 | 0.06069 | 0.11141 | 0.00034 |
| 20 | 22 | 0.05828 | 0.10699 | 0.00032 |
| 20 | 23 | 0.02408 | 0.04421 | 0.00013 |
| 22 | 23 | 0.0342 | 0.06278 | 0.00019 |
| 24 | 25 | 0.12292 | 0.17508 | 0.00002 |
| 29 | 30 | 0.00707 | 0.04256 | 0.00136 |
| 29 | 31 | 0.0097 | 0.06649 | 0.00314 |
| 29 | 32 | 0.05433 | 0.37234 | 0.01756 |
| 31 | 33 | 0.01756 | 0.04609 | 0.00217 |
| 31 | 34 | 0.03241 | 0.13837 | 0.01973 |
| 33 | 34 | 0.0097 | 0.06649 | 0.00314 |
| 34 | 35 | 0.04861 | 0.17466 | 0.00344 |
| 35 | 36 | 0.0312 | 0.11211 | 0.00882 |
| 36 | 37 | 0.01149 | 0.14603 | 0.01149 |
| 35 | 37 | 0.0312 | 0.11211 | 0.00882 |
| 37 | 3 | 0.04578 | 0.16306 | 0.00402 |
| 2 | 32 | 0.01235 | 0.08464 | 0.00399 |
| 2 | 38 | 0.06274 | 0.37753 | 0.01203 |
| 38 | 39 | 0.03917 | 0.14076 | 0.00277 |
| 39 | 40 | 0 | 0.17234 | 0 |
| 40 | 42 | 0.051 | 0.38 | 0.00134 |
| 41 | 42 | 0 | 0.013 | 0 |
| 42 | 43 | 0.01914 | 0.06356 | 0.00018 |
| 43 | 44 | 0.01604 | 0.13353 | 0.00667 |

Table 2 - The Data of Generator and Load of Sulbagsel Electrical System

| Bus | Voltage Mag | Load |  | Generator |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | MW | Mvar | MW | Mvar | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Q} \\ \max \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Q} \\ \mathrm{~min} \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 | 1.02 | 28.4 | 11.5 | 265.2 | 7.9 | 300 | 80 |
| 2 | 1.01 | 26.5 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 1.02 | 14.1 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 1.00 | 18.7 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 1.00 | 24.4 | 6.2 | 14.3 | 0.8 | 200 | 50 |
| 6 | 1.01 | 17.1 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 1.03 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 63.0 | 3.1 | 500 | 100 |
| 8 | 1.00 | 23.3 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 1.00 | 9.6 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 1.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 31.1 | 8.2 | 300 | 80 |
| 11 | 1.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 60.4 | 4.8 | 150 | 50 |
| 12 | 1.00 | 10.1 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | 0.97 | 22.1 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 1.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | 1.00 | 18.9 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | 1.00 | 33.1 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | 1.00 | 18.0 | 5.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | 0.97 | 63.3 | 18.3 | 21.0 | 7.9 | 200 | 50 |
| 19 | 0.97 | 68.3 | 17.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | 0.96 | 0.0 | -20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21 | 0.94 | 11.4 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 0.2 | 200 | 50 |
| 22 | 1.00 | 24.3 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 23 | 0.98 | 24.5 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24 | 1.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 25 | 1.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 26 | 0.97 | 19.7 | 4.7 | 12.6 | 0.0 | 150 | 50 |
| 27 | 0.97 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 28 | 1.00 | 26.5 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 29 | 0.98 | 15.7 | 3.6 | 20.0 | 5.9 | 150 | 50 |
| 30 | 1.00 | 55.2 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 31 | 0.99 | 20.6 | 4.7 | 79.0 | 39.1 | 150 | 50 |
| 32 | 1.00 | 18.6 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 33 | 1.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 196.1 | 38.6 | 300 | 80 |
| 34 | 1.00 | 17.4 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 35 | 1.00 | 27.1 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 36 | 1.00 | 21.9 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 0.5 | 200 | 50 |
| 37 | 1.00 | 32.1 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 38 | 1.02 | 11.9 | 1.5 | 8.2 | 2.1 | 200 | 50 |
| 39 | 1.00 | 49.2 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 120 | 50 |
| 40 | 1.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 41 | 1.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 195.0 | 27.2 | 300 | 50 |
| 42 | 1.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 43 | 1.00 | 4.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 44 | 1.00 | 11.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 3 - The Data of Generator Dynamic Parameters of Sulbagsel Electrical System

| Number | Generator | $R a$ | $X_{d}^{\prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Sengkang | 0 | 0.2000 |
| 2 | Pinrang | 0 | 0.3850 |
| 3 | Bakaru | 0 | 0.2680 |
| 4 | Suppa | 0 | 0.3850 |
| 5 | PLTU Barru | 0 | 0.1990 |
| 6 | Tello | 0 | 0.0995 |
| 7 | Barangloe | 0 | 0.3850 |
| 8 | Tallo Lama | 0 | 0.1990 |
| 9 | Sungguminasa | 0 | 0.3850 |
| 10 | Tallasa | 0 | 0.3850 |
| 11 | Punagaya | 0 | 0.3850 |
| 12 | Sinjai | 0 | 0.2680 |
| 13 | Makale | 0 | 0.3850 |
| 14 | Palopo | 0 | 0.3850 |
| 15 | PLTA Poso | 0 | 0.2680 |

One method that is used to solve problems related to balanced short circuit analysis is the artificial intelligence method. In this paper, the method used is the new FFA-ABC hybrid method. The selection of the new hybrid FFA-ABC method in solving short circuit analysis problems in power systems is based on the characteristics of the FFA method and the ABC method in solving problems to get the best solution, namely (1) both of these methods are included in the computational method and quantitative method, (2) both of these methods are included in the heuristic method and the artificial intelligence category, (3) both of these methods are included in the swarm method, (4) both of these methods have quite fast computing times. This FFA-ABC method has a smaller error than the FFA and ABC methods and the value obtained is close to the value obtained by the deterministic bus impedance matrix method. The parameters of the FFA and ABC methods are determine by the population size which is the same as the number of buses in the Sulbagsel system, namely $n=44$, the maximum number of iterations is maxit $=100$, the dimensions of the test function are the same as the number of generator data, namely dim=15, the upper limit (ub ) and the upper limit (lb) of the test function, the number of food sources equal to half the colony size, namely food number=n, and the food source limit. The probability is calculated based on equation 14 by finding the fitness function value of the employed bee phase. The fitness function is obtained by entering line data parameters, generator data to obtain the $\mathrm{Y}_{\text {bus }}$ matrix. Then run the load flow by entering the bus data parameters. Calculates symmetry fault by entering line data parameters. The software used to implement and run the FFA-ABC method is Matlab version R2017a.

In the new FFA-ABC hybrid method, the FFA method, and the ABC method, the distance traveled by a swarm of fruit flies (FFA) and a swarm of bee colonies (ABC) to get the best solution is carried out at the test limits ( $-2,2$ ). As in (Haripuddin, Suyuti, Mawar Said, \& Syam Akil, 2020), the main program of the new FFA-ABC hybrid method is the FFA method, where the fitness function and the index of the FFA swarm become inputs for the ABC swarm.
The algorithm procedure of the new FFA-ABC hybrid method approach proposed is described as follows (Haripuddin et al., 2020):

1. Enter the parameters FFA and ABC
2. Determine the position of the $X_{\text {axis }}$ and $Y_{\text {axis }}$ of FFA
3. Calculate the distance and the solution of FFA using the equation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Dist}_{i} & =\sqrt{X_{i}^{2}+Y_{i}^{2}} \\
S_{i} & =\frac{1}{\text { Dist }_{i}}
\end{aligned}
$$

4. Calculate the fitness function using the equation: fitness(i) $=\operatorname{ObjectFunct}(\mathrm{Si})$
5. Find the fitness minimum and index of FFA
[bestSmell,index] $=\max$ (Fitness)
6. Determine the value of solution $\mathrm{ABC}(\mathrm{ObjVal})$ based on step 5
7. Calculate the objective variable using the Equation: fitness = Object Funct(ObjVal)
8. Reset ABC trial counter
9. Remember ABC's Best Food (GlobalMin, and GlobalParams)
10.Enter into the main iterative, start iteratively from the employed bee phase.
10. Calculate the probability using equation:
prob $=(0.9 *$ fitness $/ \max ($ fitness $))+0.1$
11. Enter the onlooker bee iterative phase
12. Remember ABC's Best Food Sources (GlobalMin, and GlobalParams)
13. Enter the Scout bee phase
14. Set the food source whose trial counter exceeds the limit value
15. Enter the iterative phase of FFA
16. Update the new $X_{\text {axis }}$ and $Y_{\text {axis }}$ positions of FFA
17. Calculate the distance and the new FFA solution using the equation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Dist }_{i}=\sqrt{X_{i}^{2}+Y_{i}^{2}} \\
& S_{i}=\frac{1}{\text { Dist }_{i}}
\end{aligned}
$$

19. Repeat steps 4 and 5
20. If the new value is less than the best value. Next, update the best value
21. Find the Smellbest of FFA and best of FFA
22. If the updated FFA best value (Smellbest) is less than or equal to ABC's best food source or vice versa, and the best FFA index is less than or equal to ABC's GlobalParams index or vice versa, then Smellbest of FFA value equals global of ABC or vice versa, and the best index of FFA equals GlobalParams index of ABC or vice versa

## 4. Results and Discussions

Balanced short circuit testing is carried out on load buses that have a large enough load in the Sulbagsel interconnection electrical system. Tests were also carried out on the load bus, which was close to the slack bus (the Sengkang bus), and on the load bus, which was far from the Sengkang bus. Buses with a fairly large load are bus 19 (Panakukang bus) with a load of 68.3 MW, bus 30 (Tanjungbunga bus) with a load of 55.2 MW , and bus 39 (Palopo bus) with a load of 49.2 MW. While the closest bus to the Sengkang bus is bus 2 (Sidrap bus) with a load of 26.5 MW, the furthest bus from the Sengkang bus is bus 44 (Poso bus) with a load of 11 MW . Testing of the three-phase balanced short circuit of the Sulbagsel electrical system was carried out using the FFA-ABC hybrid method. The test results of the FFA-ABC hybrid method are compared with the results of the FFA method, the ABC method, and the bus impedance matrix method.

The magnitude of the bus voltage and line current from the balanced three-phase short circuit test using the FFA-ABC hybrid method on bus 19 (Panakukang bus), a bus that has a large load in the Sulbagsel interconnection electrical system of 68.3 MW, is shown in Tables 4 and 5. The characteristic curve of the bus voltage magnitude during faults on the Panakukang bus per unit using the FFA-ABC hybrid method is shown in Figure 4.
Table 4 - Bus Voltage Magnitude During Fault at Panakukang Bus Per Unit Using The New Ffa-Abc Hybrid Method

| Bus Number | Voltage Magnitude | Angle degrees |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.9421 | -0.2149 |
| 2 | 0.9238 | -.4897 |
| 3 | 0.9185 | -3.7368 |
| 4 | 0.9689 | -5.6034 |
| 5 | 0.9984 | -5.4861 |
| 6 | 1.0230 | -6.3643 |
| 7 | 1.0447 | -4.7587 |
| 8 | 1.0105 | -9.3183 |
| 9 | 1.0063 | -9.8022 |
| 10 | 0.9820 | -5.2691 |
| 11 | 0.9059 | -9.4009 |


| Bus Number | Voltage Magnitude | Angle degrees |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | 0.8403 | -12.1348 |
| 13 | 0.6547 | -17.8920 |
| 14 | 0.8263 | -22.8894 |
| 15 | 0.8415 | -23.9892 |
| 16 | 0.6243 | -18.3124 |
| 17 | 0.5794 | -18.4882 |
| 18 | 0.5043 | -19.0508 |
| 19 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| 20 | 0.6328 | -19.9355 |
| 21 | 0.6346 | -20.0221 |
| 22 | 0.6454 | -20.9393 |
| 23 | 0.6375 | -20.5674 |
| 24 | 0.5094 | -19.0509 |
| 25 | 0.5094 | -19.0509 |
| 26 | 0.5127 | -19.1371 |
| 27 | 0.5125 | -19.8349 |
| 28 | 0.5123 | -20.1538 |
| 29 | 0.5562 | -14.6026 |
| 30 | 0.5549 | -14.8389 |
| 31 | 0.6137 | -5.6307 |
| 32 | 0.8498 | -5.2398 |
| 33 | 0.6448 | -2.3721 |
| 34 | 0.6649 | -4.0599 |
| 35 | 0.7817 | -6.9243 |
| 36 | 0.8178 | -7.7061 |
| 37 | 0.8265 | -6.8997 |
| 38 | 0.9374 | 20.5336 |
| 39 | 0.9236 | 30.5308 |
| 40 | 0.7453 | 50.1911 |
| 41 | 0.9275 | 104.0753 |
| 42 | 0.9135 | 102.6005 |
| 43 | 0.9197 | 102.0623 |
| 44 | 0.9173 | 101.2716 |

Table 5 - Line Currents For Fault At Panakukang Bus Per Unit Using The Ffa-Abc Hybrid Method

| From Bus | To Bus | Current Magnitude | Angle degrees |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 0.5663 | -19.2687 |
| 1 | 3 | 0.4852 | -14.8309 |
| 2 | 3 | 0.1029 | -2.2790 |
| 2 | 4 | 0.9161 | 52.6851 |
| 2 | 32 | 0.9997 | -55.4698 |
| 3 | 37 | 0.6155 | -51.7423 |
| 4 | 11 | 1.1077 | -45.6091 |
| 4 | 6 | 0.4074 | 83.3431 |
| 5 | 4 | 0.5729 | -75.9861 |
| 6 | 8 | 0.2784 | -5.6506 |
| 7 | 5 | 0.4256 | -62.6560 |
| 7 | 6 | 0.3768 | -26.4462 |
| 8 | 9 | 0.0931 | -19.0712 |
| 10 | 4 | 0.4884 | -56.3979 |
| 11 | 12 | 1.8754 | -51.8324 |
| 12 | 13 | 2.2284 | -67.1633 |
| 13 | 14 | 0.4638 | 48.9669 |
| 13 | 16 | 0.7575 | -83.5620 |
| 13 | 17 | 2.4080 | -87.6491 |
| 14 | 15 | 0.3224 | 48.6432 |
| 16 | 18 | 0.6797 | -89.3355 |
| 17 | 18 | 2.3997 | -89.0579 |
| 18 | 26 | 0.3138 | 81.2411 |
| 18 | 19 | 5.5649 | -80.4774 |
| 18 | 20 | 0.3097 | 66.5985 |
| 18 | 24 | 0.0092 | 70.9381 |
| 19 | F | 5.8122 | -77.7252 |
| 20 | 21 | 0.0165 | 70.5920 |
| 20 | 22 | 0.1384 | 56.4239 |


| From Bus | To Bus | Current Magnitude | Angle degrees |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | 23 | 0.1686 | 42.6447 |
| 22 | 14 | 0.2404 | 88.7097 |
| 23 | 22 | 0.1238 | 69.7016 |
| 24 | 25 | 0.0000 | -17.0678 |
| 26 | 27 | 0.0150 | -21.7461 |
| 27 | 28 | 0.0338 | 5.8158 |
| 29 | 18 | 2.4888 | -60.1060 |
| 29 | 30 | 0.0618 | -34.6299 |
| 31 | 29 | 1.6087 | -33.8477 |
| 32 | 29 | 0.8417 | -69.2849 |
| 33 | 31 | 0.9619 | -24.0642 |
| 33 | 34 | 0.4162 | 51.0929 |
| 34 | 31 | 0.3878 | -61.1089 |
| 34 | 35 | 0.6742 | 82.6559 |
| 35 | 36 | 0.3245 | 80.2088 |
| 37 | 36 | 0.1069 | -36.9292 |
| 37 | 35 | 0.3871 | -79.8824 |
| 38 | 2 | 0.9824 | 16.4438 |
| 39 | 38 | 1.1163 | 45.9158 |
| 40 | 39 | 1.9421 | 72.0101 |
| 41 | 42 | 2.1169 | 72.7646 |
| 42 | 40 | 1.9517 | 72.4192 |
| 43 | 42 | 0.1602 | -24.8618 |
| 44 | 43 | 0.0899 | -82.7167 |



Fig. 4. Curves of The Bus Voltage Magnitude Per Unit Fault at Panakukang Bus Using The FFA-ABC Hybrid Method
Next, the comparison of the simulation results of a balanced three-phase short circuit using the FFA-ABC hybrid method with the FFA method, the ABC method, and the Bus Impedance Matrix method (BIM) for line currents per unit during a fault at the Panakukang bus is shown in Table 6.

Table 6 - The Comparison of The Simulation Results of a Balanced Three-Phase Short Circuit For Fault at The Panakukang Bus

|  |  | Line Current Magnitude |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | To | Method |  |  |  |
|  |  | FFA-ABC | FFA | ABC | BIM |
| 1 | 2 | 0.5663 | 0.5654 | 0.5648 | 0.5674 |
| 1 | 3 | 0.4852 | 0.4847 | 0.4843 | 0.4858 |
| 2 | 3 | 0.1029 | 0.1029 | 0.1029 | 0.1030 |
| 2 | 4 | 0.9161 | 0.9157 | 0.9153 | 0.9167 |
| 2 | 32 | 0.9997 | 0.9994 | 0.9992 | 1.0000 |
| 3 | 37 | 0.6155 | 0.6153 | 0.6151 | 0.6157 |
| 4 | 11 | 1.1077 | 1.1074 | 1.1072 | 1.1081 |
| 4 | 6 | 0.4074 | 0.4074 | 0.4074 | 0.4073 |
| 5 | 4 | 0.5729 | 0.5728 | 0.5728 | 0.5731 |
| 6 | 8 | 0.2784 | 0.2781 | 0.2779 | 0.2787 |
| 7 | 5 | 0.4256 | 0.4255 | 0.4255 | 0.4256 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| From | To | Line Current Magnitude |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Method |  |  |  |
|  |  | FFA-ABC | FFA | ABC | BIM |
| 7 | 6 | 0.3768 | 0.3765 | 0.3763 | 0.3772 |
| 8 | 9 | 0.0931 | 0.0930 | 0.0929 | 0.0932 |
| 10 | 4 | 0.4884 | 0.4881 | 0.4880 | 0.4887 |
| 11 | 12 | 1.8754 | 1.8747 | 1.8743 | 1.8763 |
| 12 | 13 | 2.2284 | 2.2280 | 2.2278 | 2.2287 |
| 13 | 14 | 0.4638 | 0.4637 | 0.4637 | 0.4638 |
| 13 | 16 | 0.7575 | 0.7575 | 0.7574 | 0.7576 |
| 13 | 17 | 2.4080 | 2.4082 | 2.4084 | 2.4077 |
| 14 | 15 | 0.3224 | 0.3224 | 0.3225 | 0.3223 |
| 16 | 18 | 0.6797 | 0.6798 | 0.6799 | 0.6796 |
| 17 | 18 | 2.3997 | 2.4000 | 2.4001 | 2.3994 |
| 18 | 26 | 0.3138 | 0.3138 | 0.3137 | 0.3138 |
| 18 | 19 | 5.5649 | 5.5649 | 5.5649 | 5.5649 |
| 18 | 20 | 0.3097 | 0.3097 | 0.3097 | 0.3097 |
| 18 | 24 | 0.0092 | 0.0092 | 0.0092 | 0.0092 |
| 19 | F | 5.8122 | 5.8124 | 5.8125 | 5.8119 |
| 20 | 21 | 0.0165 | 0.0165 | 0.0164 | 0.0165 |
| 20 | 22 | 0.1384 | 0.1384 | 0.1384 | 0.1383 |
| 20 | 23 | 0.1686 | 0.1685 | 0.1685 | 0.1686 |
| 22 | 14 | 0.2404 | 0.2405 | 0.2405 | 0.2404 |
| 23 | 22 | 0.1238 | 0.1238 | 0.1239 | 0.1237 |
| 24 | 25 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| 26 | 27 | 0.0150 | 0.0149 | 0.0148 | 0.0152 |
| 27 | 28 | 0.0338 | 0.0337 | 0.0336 | 0.0339 |
| 29 | 18 | 2.4888 | 2.4883 | 2.4879 | 2.4895 |
| 29 | 30 | 0.0618 | 0.0615 | 0.0613 | 0.0621 |
| 31 | 29 | 1.6087 | 1.6078 | 1.6073 | 1.6097 |
| 32 | 29 | 0.8417 | 0.8417 | 0.8416 | 0.8418 |
| 33 | 31 | 0.9619 | 0.9614 | 0.9610 | 0.9625 |
| 33 | 34 | 0.4162 | 0.4160 | 0.4159 | 0.4165 |
| 34 | 31 | 0.3878 | 0.3878 | 0.3877 | 0.3878 |
| 34 | 35 | 0.6742 | 0.6742 | 0.6742 | 0.6742 |
| 35 | 36 | 0.3245 | 0.3244 | 0.3244 | 0.3246 |
| 37 | 36 | 0.1069 | 0.1068 | 0.1068 | 0.1069 |
| 37 | 35 | 0.3871 | 0.3871 | 0.3872 | 0.3871 |
| 38 | 2 | 0.9824 | 0.9821 | 0.9819 | 0.9828 |
| 39 | 38 | 1.1163 | 1.1159 | 1.1156 | 1.1168 |
| 40 | 39 | 1.9421 | 1.9390 | 1.9371 | 1.9457 |
| 41 | 42 | 2.1169 | 2.1136 | 2.1115 | 2.1206 |
| 42 | 40 | 1.9517 | 1.9485 | 1.9466 | 1.9553 |
| 43 | 42 | 0.1602 | 0.1602 | 0.1601 | 0.1603 |
| 44 | 43 | 0.0899 | 0.0898 | 0.0897 | 0.0900 |

The voltage intervals considered by Enrique Acha, Claudio R. Fuerte-Esquivel, Hugo Ambriz-Perez, and Cesar Angeles-Camacho in the modeling and simulation of the power grid are $-5 \%$ and $+5 \%$ of the nominal voltage. Therefore, the minimum and maximum allowable voltage in the power system are $0.95 \mathrm{pu}-1.05 \mathrm{pu}$. The results of the analysis of the three-phase balanced short circuit of the Sulbagsel electrical system when the fault occurs on the Panakukang bus (bus 19) as shown in Table IV show that the system conditions are mostly experiencing voltage instability and voltage drops. Voltage stability conditions occur only on bus 4 (Pare-Pare bus), bus 5 (Pinrang bus), bus 6 (Polmas bus), bus 7 (Bakaru bus), bus 8 (Majene bus), bus 9 (Mamuju bus), and bus 10 (Suppa bus) are at $0.95-1.05$ pu voltage. The magnitude of the largest voltage drop that can cause a voltage collapse is on bus 18 (Tello bus) of 0.5043 pu. The total amount of fault current on bus 19 (Panakukang bus), namely, the bus experiencing disturbances, is 5.8122 pu such as shown in Table 5. Comparison of the total fault current on the Panakkang bus using the hybrid FFA-ABC method, FFA method, ABC method, and bus impedance matrix method is shown in Table 6 , namely 5.8122 p.u, 5.8124 p.u, 5.8125 , and 5.8119 p.u. This shows that the results obtained with the hybrid FFA-ABC method are close to the results obtained by the bus impedance matrix method with smaller errors when compared with the FFA method and the ABC method.

Meanwhile, the magnitude of the bus voltage and line current from the balanced threephase short circuit test using the FFA-ABC hybrid method on bus 30 (Tanjungbunga bus), a bus that has a large load in the Sulbagsel interconnection electrical system of 55.2 MW is shown in Table 7 and 8 . The curf of the bus voltage magnitude during faults on the Tanjungbunga bus per unit using the FFA-ABC hybrid method are shown in Figure 5.

Table 7 - Bus Voltage Magnitude During Fault at Tanjungbunga Bus Per Unit Using The New Ffa-Abc Hybrid

| Method |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From Bus | To Bus | Current Magnitude | Angle deegres |
| 1 | 2 | 0.5434 | -29.1307 |
| 1 | 3 | 0.4888 | -27.6015 |
| 2 | 3 | 0.1119 | -20.3613 |
| 2 | 4 | 1.1232 | 61.5548 |
| 2 | 32 | 1.3369 | -69.5343 |
| 3 | 37 | 0.8456 | -72.1136 |
| 4 | 11 | 1.0688 | -54.6168 |
| 4 | 6 | 0.5195 | 80.8997 |
| 5 | 4 | 0.6950 | -82.9043 |
| 6 | 8 | 0.2819 | 0.8232 |
| 7 | 5 | 0.4615 | -67.2745 |
| 7 | 6 | 0.3678 | -22.9250 |
| 8 | 9 | 0.0921 | -13.5908 |
| 10 | 4 | 0.5129 | -62.4324 |
| 11 | 12 | 1.8329 | -59.8021 |
| 12 | 13 | 2.2775 | -77.7102 |
| 13 | 14 | 0.5839 | 45.4297 |
| 16 | 13 | 0.7917 | 84.7896 |
| 17 | 13 | 2.7352 | 80.8745 |
| 18 | 16 | 0.7948 | 79.0341 |
| 18 | 17 | 2.7726 | 79.6926 |
| 18 | 19 | 0.1463 | 87.4708 |
| 18 | 20 | 0.4441 | 67.7910 |
| 18 | 24 | 0.0079 | 82.9458 |
| 20 | 21 | 0.0327 | 77.5743 |
| 20 | 22 | 0.1929 | 50.9488 |
| 20 | 23 | 0.2475 | 45.0397 |
| 22 | 14 | 0.2654 | 72.8043 |
| 23 | 22 | 0.1563 | 57.5916 |
| 24 | 25 | 0.0000 | -28.4119 |
| 26 | 18 | 0.3872 | -86.5551 |
| 26 | 27 | 0.0666 | 70.6419 |
| 27 | 28 | 0.0829 | 56.4499 |
| 29 | 18 | 4.5985 | 85.8399 |
| 29 | 30 | 7.2668 | -85.5727 |
| 30 | F | 7.5312 | -83.2406 |
| 31 | 29 | 1.4619 | -49.7103 |
| 32 | 29 | 1.2183 | -83.6190 |
| 33 | 31 | 0.8240 | -39.5541 |
| 33 | 34 | 0.6077 | 78.2790 |
| 34 | 31 | 0.5228 | -71.0736 |
| 34 | 35 | 1.0679 | 87.3547 |
| 35 | 36 | 0.4240 | 82.8051 |
| 37 | 36 | 0.1769 | -81.0135 |
| 37 | 35 | 0.6324 | -87.7401 |
| 38 | 2 | 0.9643 | 16.2057 |
| 39 | 38 | 1.0908 | 46.1330 |
| 40 | 39 | 1.8822 | 73.4304 |
| 41 | 42 | 2.0569 | 74.4657 |
| 42 | 40 | 1.8978 | 73.9657 |
| 43 | 42 | 0.1577 | -20.8837 |
| 44 | 43 | 0.0847 | -78.5880 |

Table 8 - Line Currents For Fault at Tanjungbunga Bus Per Unit Using The New Ffa-Abc Hybrid Method

| From Bus | To Bus | Current Magnitude | Angle deegres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 0.5434 | -29.1307 |
| 1 | 3 | 0.4888 | -27.6015 |


| From Bus | To Bus | Current Magnitude | Angle deegres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 3 | 0.1119 | -20.3613 |
| 2 | 4 | 1.1232 | 61.5548 |
| 2 | 32 | 1.3369 | -69.5343 |
| 3 | 37 | 0.8456 | -72.1136 |
| 4 | 11 | 1.0688 | -54.6168 |
| 4 | 6 | 0.5195 | 80.8997 |
| 5 | 4 | 0.6950 | -82.9043 |
| 6 | 8 | 0.2819 | 0.8232 |
| 7 | 5 | 0.4615 | -67.2745 |
| 7 | 6 | 0.3678 | -22.9250 |
| 8 | 9 | 0.0921 | -13.5908 |
| 10 | 4 | 0.5129 | -62.4324 |
| 11 | 12 | 1.8329 | -59.8021 |
| 12 | 13 | 2.2775 | -77.7102 |
| 13 | 14 | 0.5839 | 45.4297 |
| 16 | 13 | 0.7917 | 84.7896 |
| 17 | 13 | 2.7352 | 80.8745 |
| 18 | 16 | 0.7948 | 79.0341 |
| 18 | 17 | 2.7726 | 79.6926 |
| 18 | 19 | 0.1463 | 87.4708 |
| 18 | 20 | 0.4441 | 67.7910 |
| 18 | 24 | 0.0079 | 82.9458 |
| 20 | 21 | 0.0327 | 77.5743 |
| 20 | 22 | 0.1929 | 50.9488 |
| 20 | 23 | 0.2475 | 45.0397 |
| 22 | 14 | 0.2654 | 72.8043 |
| 23 | 22 | 0.1563 | 57.5916 |
| 24 | 25 | 0.0000 | -28.4119 |
| 26 | 18 | 0.3872 | -86.5551 |
| 26 | 27 | 0.0666 | 70.6419 |
| 27 | 28 | 0.0829 | 56.4499 |
| 29 | 18 | 4.5985 | 85.8399 |
| 29 | 30 | 7.2668 | -85.5727 |
| 30 | F | 7.5312 | -83.2406 |
| 31 | 29 | 1.4619 | -49.7103 |
| 32 | 29 | 1.2183 | -83.6190 |
| 33 | 31 | 0.8240 | -39.5541 |
| 33 | 34 | 0.6077 | 78.2790 |
| 34 | 31 | 0.5228 | -71.0736 |
| 34 | 35 | 1.0679 | 87.3547 |
| 35 | 36 | 0.4240 | 82.8051 |
| 37 | 36 | 0.1769 | -81.0135 |
| 37 | 35 | 0.6324 | -87.7401 |
| 38 | 2 | 0.9643 | 16.2057 |
| 39 | 38 | 1.0908 | 46.1330 |
| 40 | 39 | 1.8822 | 73.4304 |
| 41 | 42 | 2.0569 | 74.4657 |
| 42 | 40 | 1.8978 | 73.9657 |
| 43 | 42 | 0.1577 | -20.8837 |
| 44 | 43 | 0.0847 | -78.5880 |



Fig. 5. Curves Of The Bus Voltage Magnitude Per Unit Fault At Tanjungbunga Bus Using The New FFA-ABC Hybrid Method
Next, the comparison of the simulation results of a balanced three-phase short circuit using the New FFA-ABC hybrid method with the FFA method, the ABC method, and the Bus Impedance Matrix method (BIM) for line currents per unit during fault at the Tanjungbunga bus is shown in Table 9.

Table 9 - The Comparison of The Simulation Results of a Balanced Three-Phase Short Circuit For Fault at The
Tanjungbunga Bus

| Tanjungbunga Bus |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | To | Line Current Magnitude |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | FFA-ABC | FFA | ABC | BIM |
| 1 | 2 | 0.5434 | 0.5426 | 0.5421 | 0.5444 |
| 1 | 3 | 0.4888 | 0.4883 | 0.4880 | 0.4893 |
| 2 | 3 | 0.1119 | 0.1118 | 0.1118 | 0.1119 |
| 2 | 4 | 1.1232 | 1.1227 | 1.1225 | 1.1237 |
| 2 | 32 | 1.3369 | 1.3367 | 1.3366 | 1.3371 |
| 3 | 37 | 0.8456 | 0.8456 | 0.8456 | 0.8457 |
| 4 | 11 | 1.0688 | 1.0686 | 1.0684 | 1.0691 |
| 4 | 6 | 0.5195 | 0.5196 | 0.5196 | 0.5195 |
| 5 | 4 | 0.6950 | 0.6949 | 0.6948 | 0.6951 |
| 6 | 8 | 0.2819 | 0.2816 | 0.2814 | 0.2822 |
| 7 | 5 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4616 |
| 7 | 6 | 0.3678 | 0.3675 | 0.3672 | 0.3682 |
| 8 | 9 | 0.0921 | 0.0920 | 0.0920 | 0.0922 |
| 10 | 4 | 0.5129 | 0.5126 | 0.5125 | 0.5131 |
| 11 | 12 | 1.8329 | 1.8324 | 1.8320 | 1.8336 |
| 12 | 13 | 2.2775 | 2.2774 | 2.2773 | 2.2776 |
| 13 | 14 | 0.5839 | 0.5839 | 0.5839 | 0.5839 |
| 14 | 15 | 0.4224 | 0.4224 | 0.4225 | 0.4224 |
| 16 | 13 | 0.7917 | 0.7917 | 0.7917 | 0.7917 |
| 17 | 13 | 2.7352 | 2.7355 | 2.7357 | 2.7349 |
| 18 | 16 | 0.7948 | 0.7949 | 0.7950 | 0.7947 |
| 18 | 17 | 2.7726 | 2.7729 | 2.7730 | 2.7723 |
| 18 | 19 | 0.1463 | 0.1464 | 0.1464 | 0.1461 |
| 18 | 20 | 0.4441 | 0.4440 | 0.4440 | 0.4441 |
| 18 | 24 | 0.0079 | 0.0079 | 0.0079 | 0.0079 |
| 20 | 21 | 0.0327 | 0.0327 | 0.0327 | 0.0328 |
| 20 | 22 | 0.1929 | 0.1929 | 0.1929 | 0.1928 |
| 20 | 23 | 0.2475 | 0.2474 | 0.2474 | 0.2475 |
| 22 | 14 | 0.2654 | 0.2655 | 0.2655 | 0.2653 |
| 23 | 22 | 0.1563 | 0.1563 | 0.1563 | 0.1563 |
| 24 | 25 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| 26 | 18 | 0.3872 | 0.3872 | 0.3872 | 0.3873 |
| 26 | 27 | 0.0666 | 0.0666 | 0.0667 | 0.0666 |
| 27 | 28 | 0.0829 | 0.0828 | 0.0828 | 0.0829 |
| 29 | 18 | 4.5985 | 4.5984 | 4.5983 | 4.5986 |
| 29 | 30 | 7.2668 | 7.2667 | 7.2667 | 7.2668 |


| From |  | Line Current Magnitude |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | To | Method |  |  |  |
|  |  | FFA-ABC | FFA | ABC | BIM |
| 30 | F | 7.5312 | 7.5313 | 7.5313 | 7.5312 |
| 31 | 29 | 1.4619 | 1.4616 | 1.4614 | 1.4623 |
| 32 | 29 | 1.2183 | 1.2183 | 1.2183 | 1.2182 |
| 33 | 31 | 0.8240 | 0.8238 | 0.8237 | 0.8243 |
| 33 | 34 | 0.6077 | 0.6077 | 0.6076 | 0.6078 |
| 34 | 31 | 0.5228 | 0.5228 | 0.5228 | 0.5228 |
| 34 | 35 | 1.0679 | 1.0679 | 1.0679 | 1.0679 |
| 35 | 36 | 0.4240 | 0.4240 | 0.4239 | 0.4241 |
| 37 | 36 | 0.1769 | 0.1770 | 0.1770 | 0.1768 |
| 37 | 35 | 0.6324 | 0.6325 | 0.6325 | 0.6324 |
| 38 | 2 | 0.9643 | 0.9639 | 0.9637 | 0.9646 |
| 39 | 38 | 1.0908 | 1.0904 | 1.0902 | 1.0913 |
| 40 | 39 | 1.8822 | 1.8792 | 1.8773 | 1.8857 |
| 41 | 42 | 2.0569 | 2.0537 | 2.0517 | 2.0606 |
| 42 | 40 | 1.8978 | 1.8948 | 1.8929 | 1.9013 |
| 43 | 42 | 0.1577 | 0.1576 | 0.1576 | 0.1578 |
| 44 | 43 | 0.0847 | 0.0846 | 0.0845 | 0.0848 |

The results of the analysis of the three-phase balanced short circuit of the Sulbagsel electrical system when the fault occurs on the Tanjungbunga bus as shown in Table 9 shows that the system conditions are mostly experiencing voltage instability and voltage drops. Voltage stability conditions occur only on bus 5 (Pinrang bus), bus 6 (Polmas bus), bus 7 (Bakaru bus), bus 8 (Majene bus), bus 9 (Mamuju bus), and bus 10 (Suppa bus) is at $0.95-1.05$ pu voltage. The magnitude of the largest voltage drop that can cause a voltage collapse is on bus 29 (Sungguminasa bus) of 0.3135 pu . The total of fault current on bus 30 (Tanjungbunga bus), namely, the bus experiencing disturbances, is 7.5312 pu such as shown in Table 8. Comparison of the total fault current on the Tanjungbunga bus (bus 30) using the hybrid FFA-ABC method, FFA method, ABC method, and bus impedance matrix method is shown in Table 9, namely 7.5312 p.u, 7.5313 p.u, 7.5313 p.u, and 7.5312 p.u. This shows that the results obtained by the hybrid FFA-ABC method are the same as the values obtained by the deterministic bus impedance matrix method and the values are smaller compared to the results obtained by the FFA and ABC methods.

The magnitude of the bus voltage and line current from the balanced three-phase short circuit test using the FFA-ABC hybrid method on bus 39 (Palopo bus), a bus that has a large load in the Sulbagsel interconnection electrical system of 49.2 MW is shown in Table 10 and 11. The characteristic curf of the bus voltage magnitude during faults on the Palopo bus per unit using the FFA-ABC hybrid method are shown in Figure 6.

Table 10 - Bus Voltage Magnitude During Fault at Palopo Bus Per Unit Using The Ffa-Abc Hybrid Method

| Bus Number | Voltage Magnitude | Angle deegres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.9545 | -0.0737 |
| 2 | 0.9224 | -2.2914 |
| 3 | 0.9634 | -3.6813 |
| 4 | 1.0014 | -5.1647 |
| 5 | 1.0214 | -5.1047 |
| 6 | 1.0356 | -6.0928 |
| 7 | 1.0603 | -4.4491 |
| 8 | 1.0154 | -9.1708 |
| 9 | 1.0099 | -9.6772 |
| 10 | 1.0124 | -4.8280 |
| 11 | 1.0126 | -7.7893 |
| 12 | 0.9951 | -15.4628 |
| 13 | 0.9604 | -15.4628 |
| 14 | 0.9518 | -22.5190 |
| 15 | 0.9401 | -23.0765 |
| 16 | 0.9537 | -16.1213 |
| 17 | 0.9607 | -15.9178 |
| 18 | 0.9638 | -16.0797 |
| 19 | 0.9191 | -18.8917 |
| 20 | 0.9754 | -27.1028 |
| 21 | 0.9720 | -27.4987 |


| Bus Number | Voltage Magnitude | Angle deegres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 | 0.9625 | -27.7110 |
| 23 | 0.9660 | -27.6998 |
| 24 | 0.9736 | -16.0797 |
| 25 | 0.9736 | -16.0798 |
| 26 | 0.9739 | -16.7792 |
| 27 | 0.9330 | -23.3369 |
| 28 | 0.9164 | -24.3799 |
| 29 | 0.9792 | -13.3609 |
| 30 | 0.9688 | -14.5931 |
| 31 | 0.9964 | -6.0186 |
| 32 | 0.9267 | -4.9553 |
| 33 | 1.0147 | -2.7923 |
| 34 | 1.0052 | -5.0192 |
| 35 | 0.9906 | -8.1136 |
| 36 | 1.0046 | -8.7991 |
| 37 | 0.9797 | -7.9226 |
| 38 | 0.2573 | 17.0360 |
| 39 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| 40 | 0.0220 | 129.9059 |
| 41 | 0.0881 | 177.9377 |
| 42 | 0.0867 | 176.4628 |
| 43 | 0.0975 | 174.5932 |
| 44 | 0.1118 | 173.2640 |

Table 11 - Line Currents For Fault at Palopo Bus Per Unit Using The Ffa-Abc Hybrid Method

| From Bus | To Bus | Current Magnitude | Angle deegres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 0.6640 | -34.2489 |
| 1 | 3 | 0.4788 | 15.7881 |
| 2 | 3 | 0.2243 | 72.3267 |
| 2 | 4 | 1.2388 | 70.3474 |
| 2 | 32 | 0.5086 | 10.3029 |
| 2 | 38 | 1.7901 | -89.6427 |
| 3 | 37 | 0.4388 | 22.4125 |
| 4 | 11 | 0.5965 | 14.2673 |
| 4 | 6 | 0.2820 | 70.5420 |
| 5 | 4 | 0.3880 | -76.4136 |
| 6 | 8 | 0.3028 | -12.1252 |
| 7 | 5 | 0.3617 | -60.7453 |
| 7 | 6 | 0.4045 | -28.6998 |
| 8 | 9 | 0.1015 | -23.6162 |
| 10 | 4 | 0.4266 | -51.1277 |
| 11 | 12 | 1.1375 | -14.3991 |
| 12 | 13 | 1.0666 | -18.5985 |
| 13 | 14 | 0.2988 | -23.1650 |
| 13 | 16 | 0.3215 | -31.4498 |
| 13 | 17 | 0.2465 | 1.3203 |
| 14 | 15 | 0.2175 | -46.0274 |
| 14 | 22 | 0.1155 | 10.3527 |
| 16 | 18 | 0.0556 | 88.0979 |
| 17 | 18 | 0.1348 | 47.6650 |
| 18 | 16 | 0.0593 | -81.5219 |
| 18 | 26 | 0.5747 | 39.3612 |
| 18 | 19 | 0.7096 | -32.9783 |
| 18 | 20 | 0.4487 | -18.0658 |
| 18 | 24 | 0.0176 | 73.9213 |
| 20 | 21 | 0.0597 | -25.4290 |
| 20 | 22 | 0.1354 | -50.0912 |
| 20 | 23 | 0.2739 | -41.6098 |
| 23 | 22 | 0.0489 | -85.8283 |
| 24 | 25 | 0.0000 | 28.3152 |
| 26 | 27 | 0.2800 | -40.5619 |
| 27 | 28 | 0.2799 | -39.9630 |
| 29 | 18 | 1.8254 | -24.7992 |
| 29 | 30 | 0.5428 | -30.7995 |
| 31 | 29 | 1.9028 | -9.1024 |


| From Bus | To Bus | Current Magnitude | Angle deegres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32 | 29 | 0.4113 | 18.7409 |
| 33 | 31 | 1.2088 | -1.5007 |
| 33 | 34 | 0.6040 | -9.1240 |
| 34 | 31 | 0.1571 | -17.5218 |
| 34 | 35 | 0.3115 | -6.1922 |
| 35 | 36 | 0.1623 | 53.9284 |
| 37 | 36 | 0.2046 | 51.9952 |
| 37 | 35 | 0.0983 | 75.7059 |
| 38 | 2 | 1.7906 | 89.9077 |
| 38 | 39 | 1.7611 | -57.3911 |
| 39 | F | 1.9959 | -29.4901 |
| 40 | 39 | 0.1279 | 39.9059 |
| 40 | 42 | 0.1913 | -73.2913 |
| 42 | 41 | 0.2010 | -33.3731 |
| 43 | 42 | 0.1686 | 86.7145 |
| 44 | 43 | 0.1079 | 81.5463 |



Fig. 6. Curves of The Bus Voltage Magnitude Per Unit Fault at Palopo Bus Using The New FFA-ABC Hybrid Method
Next, the comparison of the simulation results of a balanced three-phase short circuit using the FFA-ABC hybrid method with the FFA method, the ABC method, and the Bus Impedance Matrix method (BIM) for line currents per unit during fault at the Palopo bus is shown in Table 12.

Table 12 - The Comparison of The Simulation Results of A Balanced Three-Phase Short Circuit For Fault at The Palopo Bus

|  |  | Palopo Bus |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Line Current Magnitude |  |  |  |
| From | To | Method |  |  |  |
|  |  | FFA-ABC | FFA | ABC | BIM |
| 1 | 2 | 0.6640 | 0.6631 | 0.6626 | 0.6649 |
| 1 | 3 | 0.4788 | 0.4782 | 0.4779 | 0.4794 |
| 2 | 3 | 0.2243 | 0.2243 | 0.2243 | 0.2244 |
| 2 | 4 | 1.2388 | 1.2385 | 1.2382 | 1.2393 |
| 2 | 32 | 0.5086 | 0.5081 | 0.5078 | 0.5092 |
| 2 | 38 | 1.7901 | 1.7901 | 1.7901 | 1.7902 |
| 3 | 37 | 0.4388 | 0.4383 | 0.4380 | 0.4393 |
| 4 | 11 | 0.5965 | 0.5959 | 0.5955 | 0.5972 |
| 4 | 6 | 0.2820 | 0.2820 | 0.2820 | 0.2820 |
| 5 | 4 | 0.3880 | 0.3879 | 0.3879 | 0.3882 |
| 6 | 8 | 0.3028 | 0.3025 | 0.3023 | 0.3032 |
| 7 | 5 | 0.3617 | 0.3617 | 0.3616 | 0.3618 |
| 7 | 6 | 0.4045 | 0.4041 | 0.4039 | 0.4049 |
| 8 | 9 | 0.1015 | 0.1014 | 0.1014 | 0.1016 |
| 10 | 4 | 0.4266 | 0.4263 | 0.4262 | 0.4269 |
| 11 | 12 | 1.1375 | 1.1364 | 1.1357 | 1.1388 |
| 12 | 13 | 1.0666 | 1.0656 | 1.0649 | 1.0677 |


| From | To | Line Current Magnitude |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Method |  |  |  |
|  |  | FFA-ABC | FFA | ABC | BIM |
| 13 | 14 | 0.2988 | 0.2985 | 0.2983 | 0.2991 |
| 13 | 16 | 0.3215 | 0.3212 | 0.3210 | 0.3218 |
| 13 | 17 | 0.2465 | 0.2461 | 0.2459 | 0.2469 |
| 14 | 15 | 0.2175 | 0.2173 | 0.2171 | 0.2177 |
| 14 | 22 | 0.1155 | 0.1154 | 0.1153 | 0.1156 |
| 16 | 18 | 0.0556 | 0.0555 | 0.0554 | 0.0558 |
| 17 | 18 | 0.1348 | 0.1344 | 0.1341 | 0.1353 |
| 18 | 16 | 0.0593 | 0.0592 | 0.0591 | 0.0595 |
| 18 | 26 | 0.5747 | 0.5745 | 0.5743 | 0.5750 |
| 18 | 19 | 0.7096 | 0.7090 | 0.7085 | 0.7104 |
| 18 | 20 | 0.4487 | 0.4483 | 0.4480 | 0.4492 |
| 18 | 24 | 0.0176 | 0.0176 | 0.0176 | 0.0176 |
| 20 | 21 | 0.0597 | 0.0596 | 0.0596 | 0.0597 |
| 20 | 22 | 0.1354 | 0.1352 | 0.1351 | 0.1355 |
| 20 | 23 | 0.2739 | 0.2736 | 0.2735 | 0.2742 |
| 23 | 22 | 0.0489 | 0.0488 | 0.0488 | 0.0490 |
| 24 | 25 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| 26 | 27 | 0.2800 | 0.2797 | 0.2795 | 0.2803 |
| 27 | 28 | 0.2799 | 0.2797 | 0.2795 | 0.2803 |
| 29 | 18 | 1.8254 | 1.8238 | 1.8228 | 1.8272 |
| 29 | 30 | 0.5428 | 0.5423 | 0.5420 | 0.5434 |
| 31 | 29 | 1.9028 | 1.9011 | 1.9000 | 1.9048 |
| 32 | 29 | 0.4113 | 0.4109 | 0.4106 | 0.4117 |
| 33 | 31 | 1.2088 | 1.2077 | 1.2070 | 1.2100 |
| 33 | 34 | 0.6040 | 0.6035 | 0.6032 | 0.6046 |
| 34 | 31 | 0.1571 | 0.1570 | 0.1569 | 0.1573 |
| 34 | 35 | 0.3115 | 0.3113 | 0.3111 | 0.3117 |
| 35 | 36 | 0.1623 | 0.1621 | 0.1621 | 0.1624 |
| 37 | 36 | 0.2046 | 0.2045 | 0.2044 | 0.2048 |
| 37 | 35 | 0.0983 | 0.0982 | 0.0982 | 0.0984 |
| 38 | 2 | 1.7906 | 1.7906 | 1.7906 | 1.7906 |
| 38 | 39 | 1.7611 | 1.7611 | 1.7611 | 1.7611 |
| 39 | F | 1.9959 | 1.9959 | 1.9959 | 1.9959 |
| 40 | 39 | 0.1279 | 0.1280 | 0.1281 | 0.1278 |
| 40 | 42 | 0.1913 | 0.1912 | 0.1911 | 0.1914 |
| 42 | 41 | 0.2010 | 0.2007 | 0.2005 | 0.2014 |
| 43 | 42 | 0.1686 | 0.1686 | 0.1686 | 0.1687 |
| 44 | 43 | 0.1079 | 0.1079 | 0.1079 | 0.1079 |

The results of the analysis of the three-phase balanced short circuit of the Sulbagsel electrical system when the fault occurs on the Palopo bus as shown in Table 10 show that the condition of voltage instability occurs on the bus 2 (Sidrap bus) of 0.9224 pu, bus 7 (Bakaru bus) of 1.0603 pu, bus 15 (Pangkep 70 bus) of 0.9401 pu, bus 19 (Panakukang bus) of 0.9191 pu, bus 27 (Tallo Lama 70 bus) of 0.9330 pu, bus 28 (Bontoala bus ) of 0.9164 pu, and bus 32 (Maros bus ) of 0.9267 pu . The magnitude of the voltage drop that can cause a voltage collapse is on the bus 38 (Makale bus) of 0.2573 pu, bus 40 (LTUPA 275 bus) of 0.0220 pu, bus 41 (PLTA Poso bus) of 0.0881 pu, bus 42 (Pamona 275 bus) of 0.0867 pu, bus 43 (Pamona 150 bus) of 0.0975 , and bus 44 (Poso bus) of 0.1118 pu. While, the magnitude of the largest voltage drop that can cause a voltage collapse is on the bus 40 (LTUPA 275 bus) of 0.0220 pu. The total amount of fault current on bus 39 (Palopo bus), namely, the bus experiencing disturbances, is 1.9959 pu such as shown in Table 11. Comparison of the total fault current on the Palopo bus (bus 39) using the hybrid FFA-ABC method, FFA method, ABC method, and bus impedance matrix method is shown in Table 12, namely 1.9959 p.u, 1.9959 p.u, 1.9959 p.u, and 1.9959 p.u. This shows that the results obtained by the hybrid FFA-ABC method are the same as the values obtained by the FFA method, ABC method, and deterministic bus impedance matrix method at the fault point (Palopo bus). However, the magnitude of the line current compared to other line currents shows that the results obtained by the Hybrid FFA-ABC method are closer to the values obtained by the deterministic bus impedance matrix method compared to the FFA method or ABC method.

The magnitude of the bus voltage and line current from the balanced three-phase short circuit test using the FFA-ABC hybrid method on bus 2 (Sidrap bus), a bus closest bus from Sengkang bus (Slack bus) that has a load in the Sulbagsel interconnection electrical system of 26.5 MW is shown in Table 13 and 14. The characteristic curf of the bus voltage magnitude during faults on the sidrap bus per unit using the FFA-ABC hybrid method are shown in Figure 7.

Table 13. Bus Voltage Magnitude During Fault at Sidrap Bus Per Unit Using The Ffa-Abc Hybrid Method

| Bus Number | Voltage Magnitude | Angle deegres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.3204 | -2.7060 |
| 2 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| 3 | 0.4218 | -8.2068 |
| 4 | 0.6134 | -8.1263 |
| 5 | 0.7451 | -8.0766 |
| 6 | 0.8818 | -8.3715 |
| 7 | 0.8707 | -7.0349 |
| 8 | 0.9548 | -10.4908 |
| 9 | 0.9644 | -10.8286 |
| 10 | 0.6490 | -8.0862 |
| 11 | 0.7473 | -8.4761 |
| 12 | 0.7715 | -10.3351 |
| 13 | 0.7508 | -12.7802 |
| 14 | 0.8721 | -21.2536 |
| 15 | 0.8756 | -22.4641 |
| 16 | 0.7403 | -12.8127 |
| 17 | 0.7314 | -11.8369 |
| 18 | 0.7135 | -10.5890 |
| 19 | 0.6966 | -12.8351 |
| 20 | 0.8044 | -19.6556 |
| 21 | 0.8045 | -19.9684 |
| 22 | 0.8038 | -20.6940 |
| 23 | 0.8023 | -20.4016 |
| 24 | 0.7207 | -10.5889 |
| 25 | 0.7207 | -10.5889 |
| 26 | 0.7239 | -11.1320 |
| 27 | 0.7166 | -15.9283 |
| 28 | 0.7099 | -16.8516 |
| 29 | 0.6841 | -7.3348 |
| 30 | 0.6826 | -8.1280 |
| 31 | 0.6743 | 0.3218 |
| 32 | 0.1320 | 5.7628 |
| 33 | 0.6769 | 3.7334 |
| 34 | 0.6570 | 1.5049 |
| 35 | 0.5758 | -1.6135 |
| 36 | 0.5687 | -2.1316 |
| 37 | 0.5300 | -2.7138 |
| 38 | 0.2613 | 79.8578 |
| 39 | 0.3386 | 87.7138 |
| 40 | 0.2921 | 107.4715 |
| 41 | 0.4154 | 160.4674 |
| 42 | 0.4092 | 158.9926 |
| 43 | 0.4206 | 158.1160 |
| 44 | 0.4318 | 157.0742 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Table 14 - Line Currents For Fault At Sidrap Bus Per Unit Using The New Ffa-Abc Hybrid Method

| From Bus | To Bus | Current Magnitude | Angle deegres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 4.3674 | -84.3993 |
| 1 | 3 | 0.7998 | 86.3164 |
| 2 | F | 18.9697 | -80.0014 |
| 3 | 2 | 2.0049 | -79.5977 |
| 4 | 2 | 8.2103 | -82.5701 |
| 4 | 11 | 1.6722 | 87.0117 |
| 5 | 4 | 2.5496 | -82.2421 |
| 6 | 4 | 1.9695 | -82.9256 |
| 6 | 8 | 0.4105 | 70.6928 |
| 7 | 5 | 1.1082 | -74.8704 |
| 7 | 6 | 0.2425 | 35.4579 |


| From Bus | To Bus | Current Magnitude | Angle deegres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | 9 | 0.1008 | 59.2833 |
| 10 | 4 | 1.2132 | -81.8158 |
| 11 | 12 | 0.8345 | 51.4495 |
| 12 | 13 | 0.4368 | -28.1448 |
| 13 | 14 | 0.4313 | 28.2463 |
| 13 | 16 | 0.2593 | -84.1713 |
| 14 | 15 | 0.2746 | 17.5846 |
| 14 | 22 | 0.0907 | -88.9784 |
| 17 | 13 | 0.7305 | 60.9185 |
| 18 | 16 | 0.2217 | 46.5184 |
| 18 | 17 | 0.7602 | 52.8971 |
| 18 | 26 | 0.4619 | 61.5419 |
| 18 | 19 | 0.3574 | -14.5535 |
| 18 | 20 | 0.3616 | 21.9575 |
| 18 | 24 | 0.0130 | 79.4290 |
| 20 | 21 | 0.0349 | 9.1285 |
| 20 | 22 | 0.1199 | 6.0675 |
| 20 | 23 | 0.2121 | -2.8754 |
| 23 | 22 | 0.0613 | 28.4074 |
| 24 | 25 | 0.0000 | 25.2309 |
| 26 | 27 | 0.1460 | -20.4486 |
| 27 | 28 | 0.1571 | -17.9034 |
| 29 | 18 | 1.8539 | 35.8110 |
| 29 | 30 | 0.2230 | -7.4500 |
| 31 | 29 | 1.3597 | 10.9519 |
| 32 | 29 | 1.4788 | 87.7950 |
| 32 | 2 | 1.5437 | -75.9162 |
| 33 | 31 | 0.8186 | 19.1802 |
| 33 | 34 | 0.4877 | -26.3438 |
| 34 | 31 | 0.1613 | 61.3889 |
| 34 | 35 | 0.4862 | -51.8449 |
| 35 | 36 | 0.0794 | -37.9772 |
| 35 | 37 | 0.4059 | -62.9213 |
| 36 | 37 | 0.2680 | -78.3401 |
| 37 | 3 | 0.6513 | -67.2734 |
| 38 | 2 | 0.6834 | -0.4467 |
| 39 | 38 | 0.5982 | 37.4804 |
| 39 | 40 | 0.6816 | -59.4975 |
| 40 | 42 | 0.8408 | -58.1908 |
| 42 | 41 | 0.9481 | -50.8434 |
| 43 | 42 | 0.1965 | 56.2237 |
| 44 | 43 | 0.1005 | 41.4168 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |



Fig. 7. Curves of the bus voltage magnitude per unit fault at Sidrap bus using the New FFA-ABC hybrid method
Next, the comparison of the simulation results of a balanced three-phase short circuit using the FFA-ABC hybrid method with the FFA method, the ABC method, and the Bus Impedance

Matrix method (BIM) for line currents per unit during fault at the sidrap bus is shown in Table 15.

Table 15 - The Comparison of The Simulation Results of a Balanced Three-Phase Short Circuit For Fault at The

| Sidrap Bus |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | To | Line Current Magnitude |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | FFA-ABC | FFA | ABC | BIM |
| , | 2 | 4.3674 | 4.3674 | 4.3674 | 4.3674 |
| 1 | 3 | 0.7998 | 0.7998 | 0.7998 | 0.7998 |
| 2 | F | 18.9697 | 18.9700 | 18.9701 | 18.9695 |
| 3 | 2 | 2.0049 | 2.0049 | 2.0049 | 2.0048 |
| 4 | 2 | 8.2103 | 8.2103 | 8.2104 | 8.2102 |
| 4 | 11 | 1.6722 | 1.6721 | 1.6721 | 1.6723 |
| 5 | 4 | 2.5496 | 2.5495 | 2.5495 | 2.5497 |
| 6 | 4 | 1.9695 | 1.9695 | 1.9696 | 1.9694 |
| 6 | 8 | 0.4105 | 0.4106 | 0.4106 | 0.4105 |
| 7 | 5 | 1.1082 | 1.1082 | 1.1082 | 1.1082 |
| 7 | 6 | 0.2425 | 0.2423 | 0.2422 | 0.2427 |
| 8 | 9 | 0.1008 | 0.1008 | 0.1008 | 0.1008 |
| 10 | 4 | 1.2132 | 1.2130 | 1.2130 | 1.2133 |
| 11 | 12 | 0.8345 | 0.8341 | 0.8338 | 0.8350 |
| 12 | 13 | 0.4368 | 0.4361 | 0.4356 | 0.4376 |
| 13 | 14 | 0.4313 | 0.4312 | 0.4311 | 0.4314 |
| 13 | 16 | 0.2593 | 0.2593 | 0.2593 | 0.2594 |
| 14 | 15 | 0.2746 | 0.2745 | 0.2745 | 0.2747 |
| 14 | 22 | 0.0907 | 0.0908 | 0.0908 | 0.0906 |
| 17 | 13 | 0.7305 | 0.7309 | 0.7311 | 0.7300 |
| 18 | 16 | 0.2217 | 0.2218 | 0.2219 | 0.2216 |
| 18 | 17 | 0.7602 | 0.7605 | 0.7607 | 0.7598 |
| 18 | 26 | 0.4619 | 0.4618 | 0.4617 | 0.4620 |
| 18 | 19 | 0.3574 | 0.3569 | 0.3566 | 0.3580 |
| 18 | 20 | 0.3616 | 0.3613 | 0.3612 | 0.3619 |
| 18 | 24 | 0.0130 | 0.0130 | 0.0130 | 0.0130 |
| 20 | 21 | 0.0349 | 0.0348 | 0.0348 | 0.0349 |
| 20 | 22 | 0.1199 | 0.1199 | 0.1198 | 0.1200 |
| 20 | 23 | 0.2121 | 0.2119 | 0.2118 | 0.2123 |
| 23 | 22 | 0.0613 | 0.0613 | 0.0613 | 0.0613 |
| 24 | 25 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| 26 | 27 | 0.1460 | 0.1458 | 0.1457 | 0.1462 |
| 27 | 28 | 0.1571 | 0.1569 | 0.1568 | 0.1573 |
| 29 | 18 | 1.8539 | 1.8530 | 1.8524 | 1.8550 |
| 29 | 30 | 0.2230 | 0.2227 | 0.2225 | 0.2234 |
| 31 | 29 | 1.3597 | 1.3585 | 1.3578 | 1.3611 |
| 32 | 29 | 1.4788 | 1.4788 | 1.4787 | 1.4788 |
| 32 | 2 | 1.5437 | 1.5437 | 1.5437 | 1.5436 |
| 33 | 31 | 0.8186 | 0.8178 | 0.8173 | 0.81 |
| 33 | 34 | 0.4877 | 0.4874 | 0.4872 | 0.4880 |
| 34 | 31 | 0.1613 | 0.1612 | 0.1611 | 0.1614 |
| 34 | 35 | 0.4862 | 0.4861 | 0.4860 | 0.4862 |
| 35 | 36 | 0.0794 | 0.0795 | 0.0795 | 0.0794 |
| 35 | 37 | 0.4059 | 0.4059 | 0.4059 | 0.4059 |
| 36 | 37 | 0.2680 | 0.2680 | 0.2679 | 0.2681 |
| 37 | 3 | 0.6513 | 0.6513 | 0.6514 | 0.6512 |
| 38 | 2 | 0.6834 | 0.6834 | 0.6834 | 0.6834 |
| 39 | 38 | 0.5982 | 0.5982 | 0.5981 | 0.5983 |
| 39 | 40 | 0.6816 | 0.6806 | 0.6799 | 0.6829 |
| 40 | 42 | 0.8408 | 0.8394 | 0.8385 | 0.8423 |
| 42 | 41 | 0.9481 | 0.9467 | 0.9457 | 0.9499 |
| 43 | 42 | 0.1965 | 0.1965 | 0.1965 | 0.1965 |
| 44 | 43 | 0.1005 | 0.1005 | 0.1004 | 0.1005 |

The results of the analysis of the three-phase balanced short circuit of the Sulbagsel electrical system when the fault occurs on the Sidrap bus as shown in Table 13 show that the condition of voltage stability only occurs on bus 8 (Majene bus) of 0.9548 pu , and bus 9 (Mamuju bus) of 0.9644 pu. While, the magnitude of the largest voltage drop that can cause a voltage
collapse is on the bus 38 (Makale bus) of 0.2613 pu. Comparison of the total fault current on the Sidrap bus using the hybrid FFA-ABC method, FFA method, ABC method, and bus impedance matrix method is shown in Table 15, namely 18.9697 p.u, 18.9700 p.u, 18.9701 and 18.9695 p.u. This shows that the results obtained with the hybrid FFA-ABC method are close to the results obtained by the bus impedance matrix method with smaller errors when compared with the FFA method and the ABC method. Likewise, the magnitude of the line current flowing in other lines shows that the value obtained by the FFA-ABC hybrid method is smaller than the FFA method or ABC method and is close to the value obtained by the deterministic bus impedance matrix method.

The magnitude of the bus voltage and line current from the balanced three-phase short circuit test using the FFA-ABC hybrid method on bus 44 (Poso bus), a bus that further buses from Sengkang bus (Slack bus) that has a load in the Sulbagsel interconnection electrical system of 26.5 MW is shown in Table 16 and 17. The characteristic curf of the bus voltage magnitude during faults on the Palopo bus per unit using the FFA-ABC hybrid method are shown in Figure 8.

Table 16 - Bus Voltage Magnitude During Fault at Poso Bus Per Unit Using The Ffa-Abc Hybrid Method

| Bus Number | Voltage Magnitude | Angle deegres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.9932 | 0.3234 |
| 2 | 0.9788 | -1.7822 |
| 3 | 0.9964 | -3.3481 |
| 4 | 1.0249 | -4.8515 |
| 5 | 1.0380 | -4.8300 |
| 6 | 1.0447 | -5.8954 |
| 7 | 1.0716 | -4.2247 |
| 8 | 1.0189 | -9.0629 |
| 9 | 1.0125 | -9.5857 |
| 10 | 1.0343 | -4.5127 |
| 11 | 1.0288 | -7.6194 |
| 12 | 1.0088 | -10.1596 |
| 13 | 0.9736 | -15.4724 |
| 14 | 0.9569 | -22.5443 |
| 15 | 0.9442 | -23.0743 |
| 16 | 0.9672 | -16.1560 |
| 17 | 0.9753 | -15.9766 |
| 18 | 0.9800 | -16.1838 |
| 19 | 0.9336 | -19.0363 |
| 20 | 0.9872 | -27.3754 |
| 21 | 0.9836 | -27.7782 |
| 22 | 0.9735 | -27.9729 |
| 23 | 0.9774 | -27.9709 |
| 24 | 0.9899 | -16.1838 |
| 25 | 0.9899 | -16.1839 |
| 26 | 0.9900 | -16.8929 |
| 27 | 0.9475 | -23.5516 |
| 28 | 0.9302 | -24.6066 |
| 29 | 0.9981 | -13.4511 |
| 30 | 0.9873 | -14.7067 |
| 31 | 1.0170 | -6.1017 |
| 32 | 0.9757 | -4.6021 |
| 33 | 1.0363 | -2.8738 |
| 34 | 1.0275 | -5.0883 |
| 35 | 1.0168 | -8.1156 |
| 36 | 1.0321 | -8.7929 |
| 37 | 1.0078 | -7.8475 |
| 38 | 0.7111 | 24.8029 |
| 39 | 0.5996 | 37.9757 |
| 40 | 0.3739 | 55.7546 |
| 41 | 0.1598 | 109.1729 |
| 42 | 0.1574 | 107.6981 |
| 43 | 0.1071 | 111.3649 |
| 44 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |

Table 17 - Line Currents For Fault at Poso Bus Per Unit Using The Ffa-Abc Hybrid Method

| From Bus | To Bus | Current Magnitude | Angle deegres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 0.5348 | -14.0348 |
| 1 | 3 | 0.5008 | 10.7383 |
| 2 | 3 | 0.1564 | 44.8684 |
| 2 | 4 | 0.9471 | 52.7927 |
| 2 | 32 | 0.5673 | 1.3398 |
| 3 | 37 | 0.4730 | 18.1009 |
| 4 | 11 | 0.6252 | 5.3742 |
| 4 | 6 | 0.2099 | 52.1764 |
| 5 | 4 | 0.2543 | -77.4128 |
| 6 | 8 | 0.3228 | -16.1260 |
| 7 | 5 | 0.3158 | -58.9657 |
| 7 | 6 | 0.4249 | -30.1185 |
| 8 | 9 | 0.1080 | -26.4137 |
| 10 | 4 | 0.3844 | -46.3485 |
| 11 | 12 | 1.1940 | -16.2725 |
| 12 | 13 | 1.1048 | -18.0579 |
| 13 | 14 | 0.3044 | -26.9930 |
| 13 | 16 | 0.3299 | -28.9891 |
| 13 | 17 | 0.2814 | 10.3879 |
| 14 | 15 | 0.2261 | -49.6119 |
| 14 | 22 | 0.1228 | 13.4802 |
| 16 | 18 | 0.0709 | 82.9271 |
| 17 | 18 | 0.1889 | 51.5834 |
| 18 | 16 | 0.0735 | -88.4193 |
| 18 | 26 | 0.5854 | 38.4537 |
| 18 | 19 | 0.7334 | -33.2447 |
| 18 | 20 | 0.4616 | -19.6291 |
| 18 | 24 | 0.0179 | 73.8169 |
| 20 | 21 | 0.0618 | -26.2790 |
| 20 | 22 | 0.1406 | -52.3095 |
| 20 | 23 | 0.2819 | -43.0505 |
| 23 | 22 | 0.0540 | -88.7125 |
| 24 | 25 | 0.0000 | 28.6489 |
| 26 | 27 | 0.2892 | -40.9029 |
| 27 | 28 | 0.2887 | -40.4272 |
| 29 | 18 | 1.8987 | -27.5190 |
| 29 | 30 | 0.5643 | -31.0244 |
| 31 | 29 | 1.9456 | -9.7679 |
| 32 | 29 | 0.4258 | 7.1541 |
| 33 | 31 | 1.2386 | -2.1248 |
| 33 | 34 | 0.6112 | -8.1746 |
| 34 | 31 | 0.1665 | -20.4412 |
| 34 | 35 | 0.3072 | -2.2754 |
| 35 | 36 | 0.1717 | 56.0668 |
| 37 | 36 | 0.2083 | 48.7923 |
| 37 | 35 | 0.0898 | 64.2864 |
| 38 | 2 | 1.2298 | 54.5905 |
| 39 | 38 | 1.2792 | 83.2699 |
| 39 | 40 | 1.5609 | -77.1342 |
| 40 | 42 | 0.7910 | -50.6758 |
| 41 | 42 | 0.3646 | 77.8621 |
| 42 | 43 | 0.7667 | 26.7206 |
| 43 | 44 | 0.7968 | 28.2656 |
| 44 | F | 0.8457 | 34.3133 |



Fig. 8. Curves Of The Bus Voltage Magnitude Per Nit Fault At Poso Bus Using The New FFA-ABC Hybrid Method Next, the comparison of the simulation results of a balanced three-phase short circuit using the new FFA-ABC hybrid method with the FFA method, the ABC method, and the Bus Impedance Matrix method (BIM) for line currents per unit during fault at the poso bus is shown in Table 18.
Table 18. The Comparison of The Simulation Results of A Balanced Three-Phase Short Circuit For Fault at The Poso Bus

| Bus |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | To | Line Current Magnitude |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | FFA-ABC | FFA | ABC | BIM |
| 1 | 2 | 0.5348 | 0.5338 | 0.5332 | 0.5360 |
| 1 | 3 | 0.5008 | 0.5002 | 0.4999 | 0.5015 |
| 2 | 3 | 0.1564 | 0.1564 | 0.1564 | 0.1564 |
| 2 | 4 | 0.9471 | 0.9466 | 0.9463 | 0.9477 |
| 2 | 32 | 0.5673 | 0.5668 | 0.5664 | 0.5680 |
| 3 | 37 | 0.4730 | 0.4726 | 0.4723 | 0.4736 |
| 4 | 11 | 0.6252 | 0.6246 | 0.6242 | 0.6260 |
| 4 | 6 | 0.2099 | 0.2099 | 0.2099 | 0.2100 |
| 5 | 4 | 0.2543 | 0.2542 | 0.2541 | 0.2545 |
| 6 | 8 | 0.3228 | 0.3225 | 0.3223 | 0.3232 |
| 7 | 5 | 0.3158 | 0.3157 | 0.3157 | 0.3158 |
| 7 | 6 | 0.4249 | 0.4246 | 0.4244 | 0.4253 |
| 8 | 9 | 0.1080 | 0.1079 | 0.1079 | 0.1081 |
| 10 | 4 | 0.3844 | 0.3841 | 0.3839 | 0.3847 |
| 11 | 12 | 1.1940 | 1.1929 | 1.1922 | 1.1953 |
| 12 | 13 | 1.1048 | 1.1038 | 1.1031 | 1.1060 |
| 13 | 14 | 0.3044 | 0.3042 | 0.3040 | 0.3048 |
| 13 | 16 | 0.3299 | 0.3296 | 0.3294 | 0.3302 |
| 13 | 17 | 0.2814 | 0.2810 | 0.2807 | 0.2819 |
| 14 | 15 | 0.2261 | 0.2259 | 0.2257 | 0.2263 |
| 14 | 22 | 0.1228 | 0.1226 | 0.1226 | 0.1229 |
| 16 | 18 | 0.0709 | 0.0707 | 0.0706 | 0.0710 |
| 17 | 18 | 0.1889 | 0.1884 | 0.1881 | 0.1894 |
| 18 | 16 | 0.0735 | 0.0733 | 0.0732 | 0.0736 |
| 18 | 26 | 0.5854 | 0.5852 | 0.5850 | 0.5857 |
| 18 | 19 | 0.7334 | 0.7327 | 0.7322 | 0.7342 |
| 18 | 20 | 0.4616 | 0.4611 | 0.4609 | 0.4621 |
| 18 | 24 | 0.0179 | 0.0179 | 0.0179 | 0.0179 |
| 20 | 21 | 0.0618 | 0.0617 | 0.0617 | 0.0618 |
| 22 | 22 | 0.1406 | 0.1405 | 0.1404 | 0.1408 |
| 20 | 23 | 0.2819 | 0.2816 | 0.2814 | 0.2822 |
| 23 | 22 | 0.0540 | 0.0539 | 0.0539 | 0.0541 |
| 24 | 25 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| 26 | 27 | 0.2892 | 0.2889 | 0.2887 | 0.2895 |
| 27 | 28 | 0.2887 | 0.2884 | 0.2883 | 0.2890 |
| 29 | 18 | 1.8987 | 1.8971 | 1.8961 | 1.9005 |


|  |  | Line Current Magnitude |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From | To | Method |  |  |  |
|  |  | FFA-ABC | FFA | ABC | BIM |
| 29 | 30 | 0.5643 | 0.5638 | 0.5635 | 0.5649 |
| 31 | 29 | 1.9456 | 1.9438 | 1.9427 | 1.9476 |
| 32 | 29 | 0.4258 | 0.4254 | 0.4251 | 0.4262 |
| 33 | 31 | 1.2386 | 1.2375 | 1.2368 | 1.2399 |
| 33 | 34 | 0.6112 | 0.6107 | 0.6104 | 0.6118 |
| 34 | 31 | 0.1665 | 0.1664 | 0.1663 | 0.1667 |
| 34 | 35 | 0.3072 | 0.3070 | 0.3068 | 0.3074 |
| 35 | 36 | 0.1717 | 0.1716 | 0.1715 | 0.1719 |
| 37 | 36 | 0.2083 | 0.2081 | 0.2080 | 0.2084 |
| 37 | 35 | 0.0898 | 0.0897 | 0.0896 | 0.0899 |
| 38 | 2 | 1.2298 | 1.2296 | 1.2294 | 1.2301 |
| 39 | 38 | 1.2792 | 1.2790 | 1.2788 | 1.2795 |
| 39 | 40 | 1.5609 | 1.5590 | 1.5578 | 1.5631 |
| 40 | 42 | 0.7910 | 0.7909 | 0.7908 | 0.7911 |
| 41 | 42 | 0.3646 | 0.3641 | 0.3637 | 0.3653 |
| 42 | 43 | 0.7667 | 0.7667 | 0.7667 | 0.7666 |
| 43 | 44 | 0.7968 | 0.7968 | 0.7968 | 0.7967 |
| 44 | F | 0.8457 | 0.8457 | 0.8458 | 0.8457 |

The results of the analysis of the three-phase balanced short circuit of the Sulbagsel electrical system when the fault occurs on the Poso bus (bus 44) as shown in Table 16 show that the condition of voltage instability occurs on bus 7 (Bakaru 150 kV bus) of 1.0716 pu , bus 15 (Tonasa 70 kV bus) of $0.9442 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{u}$, bus 19 ( Panakukang 150 kV bus) of 0.9336 p.u, bus 27 (Tallo Lama 70 kV ) of $0.9475 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{u}$, and bus 28 (Bontoala 150 kV bus) of 0.9302 pu . While, the magnitude of the largest voltage drop that can cause a voltage collapse is on the bus 40 (Ltupa 150 kV bus) of 0.3739 pu, bus 41 (PLTA Poso 150 kV bus) of 0.1598 p.u, bus 42 (Pamona 275 kV bus) of 0.1574 p.u, and bus 43 (Pamona 150 kV bus) of 0.1071 p.u. Comparison of the total fault current on the Poso bus using the hybrid FFA-ABC method, FFA method, ABC method, and bus impedance matrix method is shown in Table 18, namely 0.8457 p.u, 0.8457 p.u, 0.8458 and 0.8457 p.u. This shows that the results obtained by the hybrid FFA-ABC method are the same as the FFA method and the deterministic bus impedance matrix method but are better than the ABC method. However, the channel current flowing in other channels shows that the value obtained by the hybrid FFA-ABC method is closer to the value obtained by the deterministic bus impedance matrix method.

## 5. Conclusion

This paper proposes the new FFA-ABC hybrid method, which is able to solve the problem of balanced three-phase short circuits in the Sulbagsel electrical system with the smallest error compared to the FFA method and ABC method. The simulation results of the five tested cases using the new FFA-ABC hybrid method show that the largest fault current occurs when the fault is close to the slack bus generator, and the smallest fault current occurs when the fault is farthest from the slack bus generator. Future research will consider analyzing the unbalanced three-phase short circuit in the Sulbagsel electrical system by using the new FFA-ABC hybrid method.
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